THE

SPEECH

OF

HENRY GRATTAN, Esq.

ON THE SUBJECT OF A

LEGISLATIVE UNION

WITH

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE

RESOLUTIONS

OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLICS OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN;

THE

GUILD OF [illegible]ANTS;

FREEMEN AND FREEHOL[illegible] THE CITY OF DUBLIN,

AT AN

AGGREGATE MEETING

HELD ON THE 16TH OF JANUARY LAST;

THE

CELEBRATED SPEECH

DELIVERED ON THAT OCCASION BY

JOHN PHILPOT CURRAN, Esq.

AND THE

RESOLUTIONS OF THE COUNTY OF DUBLIN, &c. &c.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY J. STOCKDALE, 62, ABBEY-STREET,

NEAR CARLISLE-BRIDGE.

1800.

SPEECH

OF

HENRY GRATTAN, ESQ.

ON THE SUBJECT OF A

LEGISLATIVE UNION

WITH

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE

RESOLUTIONS

OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLICS OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN;

BRITISH MUSEUM

DELIVERED ON FRIDAY THE 15TH OF JANUARY INST.

AT A

ADJOURNED MEETING

HELD ON THE 16TH OF JANUARY LAST;

AND THE

CELEBRATED SPEECH

DELIVERED ON THAT OCCASION BY

JOHN PHILPOT CURRAN, ESQ.

AND THE

RESOLUTIONS OF THE COUNTY OF DUBLIN, &c. &c.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY J. STOCKDALE, 53, ABBEY STREET,

FOR CHARLES HARPER.

1800.

SPEECH, &c.

As no event in the hiſtory of our country can diſpute precedency of importance with that of Mr. GRATTAN's *return to Parliament in the preſent critical moment of Iriſh liberty—ſo likewiſe ſhould all conſiderations be ſecondary to that of giving fully and ſpeedily, to our country, the eloquent and incontrovertible advocacy of our great and ſteady defender.*

MR. GRATTAN.—Sir, the gentleman who ſpoke the laſt but one mentioned the ſettlement of 1782, adopting the ideas of the Miniſter of Great Britain; that Miniſter has come forward in two celebrated productions; he declares his intolerance of the Parliamentary Conſtitution of Ireland—that Conſtitution which he ordered the ſeveral Viceroys to celebrate—in defence of which he recommended the French war, and to which he ſwore the yeomen—that Conſtitution he now declares to be a miſerable imperfection; concurring with the men whom he executed, in thinking the Iriſh Parliament a grievance, and differing in the remedy only—they propoſing to ſubſtitute a Republic, and he the yoke of the Britiſh Parliament; we have ſeen him inveigh againſt their projects—let us hear him in defence of his own; he denies in the face of the two nations, a public fact, regiſtered, and recorded; he diſclaims the final adjuſtment of 1782; and he tells you that this final adjuſtment was no more than an incipient train of *negociation*.

The ſettlement of which I ſpeak conſiſts of ſeveral parts, every part a record, eſtabliſhing on the whole two grand poſitions—firſt, the admiſſion of Ireland's claim to be legiſlated by no other Parliament but that of Ireland—ſecondly, the finality impoſed upon the two nations, regarding all conſtitutional projects affecting each other;—on the admiſſion of that claim, the firſt tracts of this adjuſtment are two Meſſages ſent by his Majeſty to the Parliament of the different countries, to come to a final adjuſtment, in order to remove the diſcontents and jealouſies of the Iriſh—the ſecond, the anſwer of the Parliament of Ireland to his Majeſty's Meſſage, declaring, among other cauſes of diſcontent, and jealouſy, one great, capital, principal, and fundamental cauſe, namely, the interpoſition of the Parliament of Great Britain in the Legiſlative Regulation of Ireland, accompanied with a ſolemn proteſt againſt that interpoſition, and with a claim of right on the part of Ireland, not of the Parliament of Ireland only, but of the People of the realm, whoſe ancient and unalienable inheritance it was ſtated in that Addreſs to be—a

perpetual exemption againſt the interference of the Parliament of Great Britain, or that of any other Legiſlation, ſave only the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland. The third part of this adjuſtment was a reſolution voted by the two Britiſh Houſes of Parliament, in conſequence of ſaid Addreſs, tranſmitted by his Majeſty for their conſideration; there were two reſolutions tranſmitted---firſt, That the ſixth of George I. containing the claim of interference by the Britiſh Parliament ſhould be repealed;---the ſecond, That the connexion between the countries ſhould be placed by mutual conſent on a ſolid and permanent foundation. The third part of the covenant was, the Addreſs of the two Houſes of the Iriſh Parliament, upon the conſideration of theſe two reſolutions---which Addreſs does, among other things, accept of the propoſition contained in the firſt reſolution, and does expreſsly reject the ſecond---for it ſays that we conceive the reſolution for unqualified, unconditional repeal of the 6th of George I. to be a meaſure of conſummate wiſdom.

I drew that Addreſs---and I introduced thoſe words expreſsly to exclude any ſubſequent qualifications or limitations, affecting to clog or reſtrain the operations of that repeal, and the plenitude of the Legiſlative authority of the Iriſh Parliament. The Addreſs adds the clauſe of finality for inſtance---that gratified in thoſe particulars which it ſtates, "no Conſtitutional queſtion be-"tween the two nations will any longer exiſt."

The next part was the meaſure adopted by the Engliſh Parliament, upon the conſideration of this Addreſs; and in that meaſure, they accede to that Addreſs entirely, and unequivocally; they embrace our propoſition of unconditional and unqualified repeal, and they accordingly introduced a bill for that purpoſe ---and thus they cloſed the final adjuſtment. Our Addreſs, though no part of their reſolutions, becoming part of their covenant---as their bill of repeal, though no part of our acts, became part of our treaty.

Another inſtrument in the tranſaction is the Addreſs to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, touching the finality of this meaſure, in which are theſe words---"We have ſeen this great national arrangement eſtabliſhed on a baſis, which ſecures and unites the intereſts of both kingdoms, the objects we have been labouring for, have been accompliſhed."

The next is the declaration of the Iriſh Government, touching the finality of that arrangement---"Convince the people that every cauſe of paſt jealouſy and diſcontent is finally removed, and that both countries have pledged their good faith to each other, and that their beſt ſecurity will be their *invioiable adherence to this compact.*" There are two other parts, which are material, the reſolution of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, the 18th of June, declaring in ſubſtance, that the queſtion

was

was not how to be opened, and that the buſineſs was done, and in theſe words, that leave to bring in a bill of right was refuſed, becauſe the right of legiſlation in the Iriſh Parliament in all caſes had been already aſſerted by Ireland, and fully, and finally, and irrevocably acknowledged by Great Britain.

The next inſtrument was an addreſs to his Majeſty, to beſeech him to appoint a day of public thankſgiving for the accompliſhment of theſe great objects, as well as for his victories; thus it appears, that whatever idea might have been conceived in the ſecond reſolution of the 17th of May (82.) it was totally and entirely abandoned; the Miniſter of that time probably intended to make the beſt bargain he could for England, and therefore conceived it eligible, to condition and qualify the acknowledgement of the indepedency of the Iriſh Parliament, by certain proviſions reſpecting navigation, &c. but finding that the Iriſh Parliament would accept of nothing but the unqualified and unconditional repeal, he dropt the fruitleſs idea. I cannot preſume to ſtate his ſentiments; but I can ſtate that the Iriſh Propoſitions of unqualified and unconditional repeal, rejecting the idea of further meaſures, was adopted in England by her Parliament, which embraced the Iriſh Propoſitions of unqualified and unconditional repeal of the 6th of George the Firſt, and did repeal it accordingly without qualification, condition or limitation.

I beg leave to mention two facts, which, though not recorded, are not forgotten---the one is a declaration by Lord Lanſdown, then Secretary of State, that the repeal by the 6th of George I. was the only meaſure he meant to propoſe: the other was, a declaration by the Repreſentative of the Iriſh Government in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, made after our addreſs of the 17th of May, that no meaſures were intended to be grounded on the ſecond Engliſh reſolution of May 17th, I remember the queſtion to be aſked and ſo anſwered.

I think I have now ſhewn from the records quoted, that the argument of the Miniſter is againſt the expreſs letter, the evident meaning and honeſt ſenſe of this final ſettlement---and I repeat that finality was not only a part of the ſettlement, but one of its principal objects---the caſe is ſtill ſtronger againſt him, finality was the principal object of his country as Legiſlative Independency was the object of ours. Ireland wiſhed to ſeize the moment of her ſtrength for the eſtabliſhment of her liberties---the Court of England wiſhed to conclude the operations of that ſtrength, and bound its progreſs.--- The one country wiſhed to eſtabliſh her liberty, the other to check the growth of demand. I ſay, the growth of demand, it was the expreſſion of the time; the Court of England came therefore to an agreement with this country, viz. to eſtabliſh for ever a free and independent exiſtence of the Iriſh Parliament, and to preſerve for ever the unity

of the British empire---the former by the above-mentioned adjustment, the latter by the clause of finality to that adjustment annexed, and by precluding then, and at all times to come, the introduction of any further Constitutional questions in either country, affecting the connexion, which was to rest under solemn covenant, unimpregnable, and invincible to the intrigue or ambition of either country, founded on the prudent, the profound, the liberal, and the eternal principle of Unity of Empire and Separation of Parliament.

I might, however, wave all this, and yet the Minister would get nothing by it---I might allow, contrary to common sense, that final adjustment as proposed by his Majesty, means incipient negociation---I will suppose, contrary to truth, to public faith, public honor, and common policy, that the Councils of Great Britain at that time meant to leave the Irish Constitution open to the encroachments of British Parliament and the British Empire, open to the encroachments of the Irish Volunteer, that is, that she meant to expose the solidity of her empire, in order to cheat the Irish, first of their opportunity, and afterwards of their Constitution, and yet he has gained nothing by these preposterous concessions, because he must allow, that the arrangement did proceed to certain articles of covenant, and the first article on the part of England excludes his Union, being the assent of the Parliament of Great Britain to the requisition of the People of Ireland, which was, to be exempted in all times to come from the interference of British Parliaments, and to have established over them no other Legislature whatever save only that of the King, Lords and Commons of Ireland. Admitting then, the ridiculous idea of ulterior measures to follow final adjustment, a Union could not be one of them; it is hardly necessary to mention, that he has been Minister ever since that period, that during the whole of that time he never ventured to name Union as one of those further measures---not in 1783 when a bill was brought in by the Ministry---not in 1785, when he introduced his celebrated Propositions, and stated the second resolution of the 17th of May, 1782, to comprehend not the Constitution but the Commerce of both countries---not in the Administration of 85---not, in short, until he had reduced this country by a train of calamitous measures, and religious divisions, to the condition of a conquest, such as she was when the Parliament of England, at the close of the last century, took away her Trade, and in the middle of the present took away her Constitution. The Minister proceeds, he impeaches the Constitution of 1782, from disavowing an arrangement so adjusted at that time, and an adjustment so concluded, he advances and calls that adjustment a miserable imperfection, after fifteen years panegyric, and when he has a great army in Ireland he has made that discovery, and instead of a Constitution which

established

eſtabliſhed peace in Ireland, he revives a principal which produced war in America, namely that two independent legiſlatures are incompatible; this was the language of Lord North's ſword in the colonies, this is the language of Mr. Pitt's ſword in Ireland, and the doctrine of an imperial Legiſlature which loſt Great Britain---America, and which Great Britain ſurrendered to Ireland, takes once more its bloody ſtation in the pages of the Miniſter, in defiance of faith, and in contempt of experience; it ſeems as a Britiſh Parliament is diſpoſed to ſurrender its liberties to the court, the court is diſpoſed to advance its domination over all the Britiſh connections; ſimilarity of Conſtitution is no longer the bond of connection, all are to be ſwallowed up according to this doctrine, in one imperial Parliament whoſe powers are to encreaſe as the boundaries of the empire contract, and the ſpirit of her liberties declines.

"You aboliſhed," ſays he, "one Conſtitution," but you forgot to form another,"---Indeed!---What! does he mean that we ſhould have demoliſhed a uſurpation: in order to mangle a Conſtitution? Does he mean that we ſhould have overſet the tyranny of one Parliament to mangle another? In ſhort, does he mean that we ſhould have taken away the uſurped and tyrannical powers of the Legiſlature of England, in order to reſtore thoſe uſurped and tyrannical powers to that very Legiſlature? ---In what branches? His propoſitions have ſtated them; Commerce, &c. the very branches in which they had been by that very Legiſlature moſt oppreſſively and egregiouſly, obſtinately and tranſcendantly abuſed. Moſt certainly the conductors of that ſettlement on the part of Ireland did not think proper ſo to reſtore the grievance of a foreign Legiſlation, and ſo to limit the powers of a domeſtic one. The Miniſter has given in his ſpeech the reaſon---"All the great branches of trade (by which he muſt mean the linen trade, the plantation trade, the import trade) are to be aſcribed to the liberality of England, not to covenant."---I deny it---but as Miniſters may deny covenants, it ſeemed prudent to reſerve the powers of Parliament, and accordingly the Iriſh Legiſlature retains full and ample reſources, under the ſettlement of that time, to incline the councils of England to remember and obſerve her compacts with our country, ſhould the Britiſh Miniſter be diſpoſed to forget them---thus the Parliament of Ireland can ſo regulate her intercourſe with other countries for colonial produce, ſo regulate her right to an Eaſt India trade, and ſo duty her channel trade, as to ſecure a preference in the Engliſh market to her linens, and to ſecure a direct intercourſe with the Britiſh plantations: was Ireland to retain thoſe powers with a view to annoy? No; but ſhe was to retain them, and to retain them leſt Great Britain, inſtigated by ſome Miniſter, might be induced to exerciſe once more thoſe very powers of annoyance with which now the Right

Honorable

Honorable Gentleman threatens Ireland; in ſhort, leſt Great Britain ſhould retain all her powers of moleſtation, and Ireland ſhould ſurrender all her powers of retaliation. The claſſic Miniſter muſt know---Tacitus has told him---that between the powerful and the impotent there can be no peace; the powers I ſpeak of were powers of peace---they were powers of protection---they were the great reſerves of the Iriſh Parliament to ſecure the trade of Ireland and harmony of empire; the wiſdom of the reſerve ſuch a Miniſter as he is was born to eſtabliſh---ſtrange ideas this Miniſter entertains of the Conſtitution of an Iriſh Parliament.---It ſhould be incompetent---it ſhould be omnipotent---incompetent to regulate the commerce of the country---omnipotent to overturn her Conſtitution: it ſhould be inadequate and almighty---inadequate to protect---almighty to ſell the people; its divine powers are to ariſe from its obſequiouſneſs, and the act of its ſurrender with him conſtitutes its omnipotence.

The Miniſter proceeds---he ſpecifies his objections to this ſettlement of 82---the Regency is one, and war another---facts are againſt him in both---He ſtates, that it was accident alone, meaning the recovery of his Majeſty, that preſerved the identity of the Executive power at the time of the Regency. He miſtates that fact, totally and entirely---it was not accident, viz. the recovery of the King, that preſerved the identity of the Executive Powers---that identity was preſerved amply, carefully, and affectionately, by the determination of the Iriſh Parliament in chooſing for their Regent the Heir apparent of the Crown, already deſignated and determined upon, though not in form inveſted by the Parliament of Great Britain. The Iriſh Parliament provided in that event not only for the preſervation of the Monarchial principle, but for the preſervation of connexion likewiſe, and adhered to his country, though they did not link themſelves to his party. The principle that came under the conſideration of the Iriſh Parliament was three-fold—the principle of Monarchy, the principle of Connexion, and the principle of Party. With regard to the two firſt, they concurred with the Parliament of England; they choſe as Regent the next in ſucceſſion to the Crown; and they choſe him after, and not before the Parliament of Great Britain had ſignified, with the Miniſter at their head, their determination to appoint him, and in ſo doing *they* followed faithfully the ſpirit of the act of annexation of the Crown, which forms between the two countries their bond and connexion, but a bond and connexion through the medium of Monarchy. I am ſtating the ſpirit of that act, without defending or condemning it. I ſay the act of annexation, and ſo the bill of 82, altering and amending the act of Poynings, and ordaining that Iriſh bills ſhall be ſent to the King, looks to the bond and connexion of theſe iſlands through

the

the medium of Monarchy. A Britiſh Republic never was in the contemplation of either; but an Engliſh Monarchy, and no other form of Government, was preſent to the conceptions of both, giving thereby the Royal Houſe, who are the Monarchs of Ireland, as well as of Great Britain, a double ſecurity, and the Throne upon which they ſit a double-root. I ſay the Parliament of Ireland did adhere to the principles of Britiſh connexion, and did unite with them the ſafe and the preſcribed principles of Monarchial Government—they did concur with the Parliament of England, in the choice of a Regent, in the perſon of his Royal Highneſs the Prince of Wales, and after his deſignation by Great Britain; but with regard to the third principle, namely, the principle of Party, they differed, the Parliament of England thinking proper to encumber the Regent with extraordinary limitations, and that of Ireland judging it more eligible to leave him in full exerciſe of all the Executive Powers; it therefore rejected a motion of delay, knowing the object of that motion was to poſtpone the appointment until the then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, ſhould have formed a formidable faction confederated againſt the future Government.

In ſhort, the Parliament of Ireland did not think it proper to appoint a Regent with leſs than Regential power, and to conſtitute in oppoſition a Miniſter with great portions of Regal authority. Hence, perhaps, this Union—hence, perhaps the viſitation of calamitous government which has befallen Ireland ever ſince. One of the Miniſter's inſtruments in this country has confeſſed it—he has ſaid in one of his ſpeeches publiſhed by his authority, that all the misfortunes of this country ſprung from that reſentful period. But who is it reproaches Ireland upon this ſubject, moſt injurioufly and unjuſtly, with the crime of availing herſelf of the opportunity afforded by that moſt calamitous event that viſited the health of our Sovereign? 'Tis that very Miniſter who publiſhed that opportunity in the broadeſt and moſt unqualified reſolution—who told the Parliament of both countries, that they were perfectly competent to ſupply, in that melancholy moment, the deficiency in the executive magiſtrate by any method which they thought proper, that is, who told the Britiſh Houſes of Parliament they were competent to eſtabliſh a temporary Republic—and told the Iriſh Houſes, of courſe and by neceſſary inference, that they were competent to eſtabliſh a temporary Republic, and to accompliſh a temporary Separation. To have declined the opportunity is called the Ambition of our Parliament—to have proclaimed the opportunity is called the Moderation of the Miniſter.—His partizan in this country, went further—he maintained the power of the Britiſh Parliament to bind Ireland—

Ille impiger hauſit
Spumantem pateram et pleno ſe
——————proluit auro.

According

According to the two opinions, the two Houſes of the Britiſh Parliament could overturn the Britiſh Monarchy and Iriſh Conſtitution.

The Miniſter proceeds—he ſtates a ſecond inſtance, namely that of war; here again the fact is againſt him; the Parliament of Ireland have ever ſince their Emancipation concurred with England on the ſubject of war, but they have concurred with this remarkable difference, that before their Emancipation their concurrence was barren, and ſince their Emancipation it has been productive. Immediately on the ſettlement of that Emancipation in 1782, they voted a ſum for Britiſh ſeamen, and on the apprehenſion of a war with Spain in 1790, they voted another—and in the preſent war under Lord Fitzwilliam's Adminiſtration they voted a third. So much more beneficial are the wild offerings of Liberty, than the ſqueezings, and eviſcerations, and excruciations of power. But all this is loſt upon the Miniſter—fact and bounty make no impreſſion on him; he has againſt both a fallacious argument, and an hungry ſpeculation—he thinks he foreſees that the Parliament of Ireland may diſſent from that of Great Britain on the ſubject of war—that peace or war are in the department of the King, not of the Parliament. He knows, that on a proclamation by his Majeſty, Ireland is in a ſtate of war—of courſe without the aſſent of the Houſes of Parliament. He knows that the ſupply of that war depends not on the Parliament of Ireland, but of Great Britain; therefore, the interference of the Parliament of Ireland on that ſubject is little more than the declaration of a ſentiment. Now the declaration of a ſentiment on ſuch a ſubject is only valuable, as it is the ſentiment of a nation;—and the concurrence of Ireland in Britiſh wars can only be the ſentiment of the nation, as the Conſtitution of the nation, that is to ſay, the Rights of Ireland, as claimed by herſelf, to be exempted from the Legiſlative authority of a Britiſh Parliament—tendered, regarded, and protected by the Britiſh Empire. It is not the iſle of Ceylon, the Cape of Good Hope, the Myſore country, nor the dominions of Tippoo, nor yet the feathers of her weſtern wing that engage the attention or intereſts of Ireland—it is her own internal freedom and Conſtitution—it is her own idea of that internal freedom and Conſtitution, not ſuch as Britiſh Miniſters who have invaded that Conſtitution too often ſhall hold forth, nor ſuch as Engliſh and Scotch metaphyſicians, who forged chains for America, and called them her Conſtitution, and are ready now to caſt links for Ireland, with the foreign ſtamp of Iriſh Liberty—but that Conſtitution which ſhe herſelf, Ireland, feels, comprehends, venerates, and claims—ſuch as ſhe herſelf expreſſed, both in her Convention at Dungannon, and through all her counties and cities, and in every deſcription and aſſociation of people, and afterwards in full Parliament claimed, carried, regiſtered, and recorded

recorded—it is for the preſervation of this Conſtitution that ſhe is intereſted in Britiſh wars—ſhe conſiders the Britiſh Empire a great weſtern barrier againſt invaſion from other countries. Invaſion on what? Invaſion on her liberties, on her rights and privileges, invaſion on ſelf-legiſlation, the parent and protectreſs of them all. She hears the Ocean proteſting againſt Separation, but ſhe hears the Sea likewiſe proteſting againſt Union;—ſhe follows, therefore, her phyſical deſtination, and obeys the diſpenſations of Providence—when ſhe proteſts, like that Sea, againſt the two ſituations, both equally unnatural—Separation and Union; but then, ſhe feels her Conſtitution to be her great ſtake in the Empire, and ſhe contemplates the Empire as the great ſecurity of her Conſtitution. Our liberty we think is ſecured by this great weſtern barrier, and we give our ſtrength to this weſtern barrier for the ſecurity of our liberty—but if Britiſh Miniſters ſhould do that very miſchief which we apprehend from the foreigner, namely, take away the Parliamentary inſtitutive of the Realm—they take away with that, our intereſt in the Britiſh dominions; and thus withdraw at once a great pillar of Liberty and Empire.

On theſe principles I ſuppoſe the diſſent of Ireland on the ſubject of war highly improbable, as it is uninſtanced—but I ſhould attribute, like the Miniſter, infallibility to thoſe Councils that engage their country in a war; ſhould I ſuppoſe the diſſent of Ireland on ſuch a ſubject at all times to be fatal. Happy had it been for Great Britain—happy had it been for his Majeſty—happy had it been for his glory and renown in all times to come, had not the Parliament of Ireland, in the American war, curſed him with her concurrence. What could the Tutelary Angel of England have done more? If that Angel had been Minerva, and that Minerva ſate in Parliament, ſhe would then have held, over the Councils of that time, the ſhield of her diſpleaſure—or what could the Demon of Great Britain have done more, or the Avenging Genius of the Colonies which her cabinet butcheted, than to have filled full and overflowing the meaſure of her malice—in an humble and dutiful addreſs of thanks and concurrence, looking back to the wars in which Great Britain has been engaged—I ſhould therefore ſuggeſt, that ſhe is in leſs danger from the heſitation of Ireland, than from the precipitation of Great Britain. In this part of his argument the Miniſter is weak; but in his remedy is not only weak, but miſchievous; he propoſes by taking away our powers of diſſent to withdraw our motive of concurrence, and to ſecure our ſilence, forfeits our affection—He foreſees an improbable event—of that event he greatly exaggerates the danger, and provides a remedy which makes that danger, not only imminent but deadly.

I will put this queſtion to my country—I will ſuppoſe her at the bar, and I will aſk them, will you fight for a Union as you

would for a Conſtitution? Will you fight for that Lords and Commons, who, in the laſt century, took away your Trade, and in the preſent the Conſtitution, as for that King, Lords, and Commons who have reſtored both?

Well, the Miniſter has deſtroyed this Conſtitution—to deſtroy is eaſy---the edifices of the mind, like the fabricks of marble, require an age to build—but aſk only a Miniſter to precipitate, and, as the fall is of no time, ſo neither is it the effect of any ſtrength—a common Labourer and pick-ax, a little Lawyer, a little Pander, and a wicked Miniſter—ſo periſh the works of men!

That Conſtitution, which with more or leſs violence has been the inheritance of this country for 600 years; that *modus tenendi parliamentum*, which laſted and out-laſted of Plantagenet wars ---of Tudor the violence---and of Stuart the ſyſtematic falſhood---the condition of our connexion---yes, the pillar he deſtroys is one of the pillars of the Britiſh Empire; he may walk round it, and round it, and the more he contemplates, the more he muſt admire it; ſuch a one as had coſt England of money a million, and of blood a deluge---cheaply and nobly expended dear in its violation, dear in its recovery---whoſe reſtoration had coſt Ireland her nobleſt efforts, and was the habitation of her loyalty—we are accuſtomed to behold the Kings of theſe countries in the keeping of Parliament—I ſay of her loyalty, as well as of her liberty, where ſhe had hung up the ſword of the Volunteer; her Temple of Fame, as well as of Freedom.

I have done with the pile which the Miniſter batters—I come to the Babel which he builds, and as he throws down without a principle, ſo does he conſtruct without a foundation. This fabric he calls an Union; and to this, his fabric, there are two ſtriking objections. Firſt, it is no Union—it is not an identification of people, for it excludes the Catholics—2dly, it is a conſolidation of the Iriſh Legiſlatures, that is to ſay, a merger of the Iriſh Parliament, and incurs every objection to an Union, without obtaining the only object which a Union profeſſes—it is an extinction of the Conſtitution, and an excluſion of the people. Well! he has overlooked the people as he overlooked the ſea. I ſay he excludes the Catholics for ever, and for the very reaſon which he and his advocates hold out as the ground of expectation—that hereafter, in a courſe of time, (he does not ſay when) if they behave themſelves, (he does not ſay how) they may ſee their ſubject ſubmitted to a courſe of diſcuſſion, (he does not ſay with what reſult or determination)—and as the ground for this inane period, in which he promiſes nothing, in which he can promiſe nothing, and in which, if he did promiſe much, at ſo remote a period he could perform nothing— unleſs he, like the evil he has accompliſhed, be immortal. For this inane ſentence, in which he can ſcarcely be ſaid to deceive

the

the Catholic, or ſuffer the Catholic to deceive himſelf, he exhibits no other ground than the phyſical inanity of the Catholic body accompliſhed by an Union, which, as it deſtroys the relative importance of Ireland, ſo it deſtroys the relative proportion of its Catholic inhabitants, and thus they become admiſſible, becauſe they ceaſe to be any thing. Hence, according to him, their brilliant expectation; "you were" ſay his advocates and ſo imports his argument, "before the Union, as four to one —you will be by the Union as one to four." Thus he founds their hopes of political power on the extinction of poilical conſequence, and makes the inanity of their body, and the non-entity of their country, the pillars of their future ambition. Let me add, that even though the Catholic were admitted into Parliament, by the articles of Union, it would be of little avail to the body. What ſignifies to the body whether a Catholic individual be an inſignificant UNIT in the Engliſh Parliament or in the ſtreet; in either caſe he would be nothing—he would belong to nothing —he would have nothing to which he could belong—no country—no Iriſh people—no Iriſh nation.

The Catholics of the City of Dublin have come forth in ſupport of the Conſtitution—I rejoice at it—they have anſwered their enemies by the beſt poſſible anſwer—by ſervices—ſuch anſwer is more than refutation—it is triumph. The man who ſupports and preſerves Parliament qualifies—the path of glory leads on to privilege---enjoy with me if you pleaſe—without me if you be illiberal—but by me certainly---and at all events enjoy the Parliamentary Conſtitution of your country. This is to defend the Tower---this is to leap upon the wreck---this is to ſit by the country in her ſick bed---if ſhe recover, there is a long and bright order of days before her, and the Catholics will have contributed to that event---if ſhe periſh, they will have done their utmoſt to ſave her---they will have done as an honeſt man ought in ſuch a caſe---they will have flung out their laſt ſetting glories, and ſunk with the country.

The Miniſter, by his firſt plans, as detailed by his advocates, not only baniſhed the Catholics from Parliament, but baniſhed the Proteſtant poor likewiſe, for he baniſhed them from a due repreſentation therein---he ſtruck off one half of the county repreſentatives, and preſerved the proportion of boroughs as two to one---thus he diſpoſed of the queſtions of Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform, by getting rid of both for ever: thus did he build his firſt plan of Union upon the abuſes both of Church and State, and reformed neither---religious monopoly, and borough monopoly, he continued to exclude the Catholic from Parliament, and he continued to ſhut out both Proteſtant and Catholic from a due and effectual Parliamentary Repreſentation---he ſhut out Proteſtant Aſcendancy, as well as Catholic Participation, and in the place of both, conſtituted

borough aſcendancy in perpetual abuſe and dominion--he reformed the Britiſh Parliament by nearly ſixty Iriſh Borough Members; he reformed the Iriſh Parliament by 558 Engliſh and Scotch Members---and on this mutual miſrepreſentation conſtituted an Imperial Legiſlature; there was no great effort of ability in all this---much felicity of miſchief---no expenditure neither of time nor talent---there was nothing in the ſcheme which was grand---nothing which was deep---nothing which was comprehenſive; he demoliſhed an old inſtitution, at the ſame time that he preſerved old abuſes, and put himſelf at their head, and entailed them on poſterity like a common diſorder, to be continued through what he calls a parental Parliament. Such a plan was too deſperate, as far as relates to the proportion of counties and boroughs. I underſtood it is in part abandoned, and well it may, becauſe whether theſe Repreſentatives be in a greater or leſſer proportion Borough-Members, they will be the Hoſt of Adminiſtration, and not the Repreſentatives of the People. He takes 100 Members, many of whom are removed by the nature of their election from their country, are withdrawn from that of ſympathy, from that of opinion. He changes the ſphere not only of their action but of their character, and of their ſenſations. How came the Iriſh Parliament, with all its Borough Members, in 1779, to demand a free trade---in 1782, to demand a free Conſtitution? Becauſe it ſate in Ireland---becauſe they ſate in their own country---and becauſe at that time they had a country---becauſe however influenced, as many of its members were by places---however uninfluenced as many of its Members were by popular repreſentation, yet were they influenced by Iriſh ſympathy, and an Iriſh law of opinion, they did not like to meet every hour faces that look ſhame upon them; they did not like to ſtand in the ſphere of their own infamy, thus they acted as the Iriſh Abſentee at the very ſame time did not act, they ſaved the country becauſe they lived in it, as the others abandoned the country becauſe they lived out of it.

I will not ſay that 100 Iriſh Gentlemen will act ill where any man would act well, but never was there a ſituation in which they had ſo much temptation to act ill and ſo little to act well; great expenſe and conſequent diſtreſſes, ſupport from the voice of an Iriſh public, no check, they will be in ſituation a ſort of gentlemen of the Empire, that is to ſay, gentlemen at large, unknown by one country and unelected by the other, ſuſpended between both, falſe to both, and belonging to neither. The ſagacious Engliſh Secretary of State has foretold this, "what advantage (ſays he) will it be to the talents of Ireland, this opportunity "in the Britiſh Empire thus opened;" that is what we dread, the market of St. Stephen opened to the individual, and the talents of the country, like its property, draughted from the kingdom of Ireland to be ſold in London; theſe men from

the

the influence of repreſentation, all of whom by the removal from their ſituation, (man is the child of ſituation) their native honour may ſtruggle; but from their ſituation they will be adventurers of the moſt expenſive kind, adventurers with pretenſions, dreſſed and ſold, as it were, in the ſhrouds and grave-cloaths of the Iriſh Parliament, and playing, for hire, their tricks on her tomb—the only repoſitory the Miniſter will allow to an Iriſh Conſtitution, the images of degradation, and the repreſentatives of nothing.—Come, he has done much---he deſtroyed one Conſtitution, he has corrupted another---and this corrupted Conſtitution he calls a Parental Parliament.

I congratulate the country on the new baptiſm of what was once called the Repreſentative Body of the Nation; inſtead of the plain auguſt language of the Conſtitution, we are here ſaluted with the novel and barbaric phraſeology of Empire.

With this change of name, we perceive a tranſfer of obligation, converting the duty of the Delegate into the duty of the Conſtituent, and the inheritance of the people into the inheritance of their Truſtees.

There is not in this plan any one profound, comprehenſive, or exalted conception. Well, this Aſſembly, this Imperial Parliament, what are its elements? Iriſh Abſentees, who have forſaken their country, and a Britiſh Parliament that took away the Conſtitution---does he ſay that ſuch a Parliament will have no prejudices againſt Ireland. Let him look to his ſpeeches; a capital underſtanding, a comprehenſive knowledge, and a tranſcendent eloquence; hear him with all theſe powers, ſpeak on the ſubject of Ireland, whether it be the conduct of her Adminiſtration, the character of the People, the Commerce, or her Covenants, or the Conſtitution, and he betrays an ignorance that would diſhonour an idiot. Does he wiſh for further inſtances? let him look to the ſpeeches of his agents in Ireland ---ſpeeches made and publiſhed for the palate and prejudices of the Engliſh Court. What deſcription of men have they not traduced? what patriot atchievement have they not depreciated? what honeſt character have they not belied? Does he look for further inſtances? let him turn to his catalogue—what notorious apoſtate has he not honoured? what impudent defamer of the rights and character of Ireland that he has not advanced? On the other hand, what man that made a ſtand for her liberties whom he has not diſmiſſed? Mr. Fitzgerald, Sir John Parnel alſo, who has ſupported his Government long, refuſes to abandon their country and their honour was immediately told they were no longer fit for the ſervice of Government. Mr. Foſter who had ſupported his Adminiſtration long, held up his ſhield for that Parliament of which he is the natural advocate, and was immediately honoured by the enmity of the Court, and a perſonal attack on his character and conſiſtency.

Lord

Lord Fitzwilliam, an Engliſhman, a friend to the war, a ſtrenuous advocate for order and regular government, with character that is purity itſelf, entertained for Ireland a fatal affection, and by that one offence cancelled all his long and ſplendid catalogue of virtues, and does he diſclaim prejudices againſt Ireland?

A Legiſlature the parent of both countries he talks of; a Legiſlature, as far as relates to Ireland, free from the influence of vicinity, of ſympathy;---the Iſle of Man is all that, free from the influence of opinion, free from the influence of duty, directed by prejudices, and unincumbered with knowledge. In order to judge what this parental Legiſlature would be, let us conſider what the Britiſh Parliament has been, and let us compare that Parliament for this purpoſe, with the Legiſlature of Ireland, and in this compariſon I do not mean to approve all the Parliaments that have ſat in Ireland. I left the former, becauſe I condemned its proceedings; but I argue not like the Miniſter, from the miſconduct of one Parliament, againſt the being of Parliament itſelf. I value that Parliamentary Conſtitution by the average of its benefits; and I affirm, that the bleſſings procured by the Iriſh Parliament in the laſt twenty years are greater than all the bleſſings afforded by Britiſh Parliaments to Ireland for the laſt century, greater even than the miſchiefs inflicted on Ireland by Britiſh Parliaments, greater than all the bleſſings procured by theſe Parliaments for their own country within that period---within that time the Legiſlatures of England loſt an empire, and the Legiſlature of Ireland recovered a Conſtitution.

Will we have done with this parental Parliament, and now come to the bribes which he holds out? And firſt, he begins with the Church; to the Proteſtant Church he promiſes perpetual ſecurity; to the Catholic Church his advocates promiſe eventual ſalary; and both hold out to the former commutation of tythes.

With reſpect to the Proteſtant Church, whatever may be his wiſhes in favour of its duration, he takes the ſtrongeſt meaſures to accompliſh its deſtruction, for he attempts to diſgrace it to all eternity; he is employing, or his agents are employing ſeveral of its members to negociate away the Conſtitution, and to mendicate addreſſes transferring to another country the Parliament and Legiſlative Power of their own, diſfranchiſing the very people by whom the Church is fed, and deſerting the holy miſſion of God to fulfil this profligate miſſion of the Miniſter. Give up your country, ſays the Miniſter, give up your character, and be immortal; ſo ſaid Charles I. to his Church, when he prohibited the Goſpel, and regimented the Clergy into battalion againſt the Conſtitution, and overturned the Church by its own infamy.

At the ſame time that the Miniſter endeavours to take away by his meaſures the authority of the Church; his advocates tell

you

you, that he propoſes to bribe the Catholic clergy, if they will betray the Conſtitution. In whatever form of religion our pious Court contemplates the Almighty, it ever occurs to convert him to ſome diabolical purpoſe. The Catholics had been accuſed pretty liberally of diſloyalty, by thoſe very advocates who now ſeem to think it is proper to reward their imputed treaſons againſt the King, provided they ſhall be followed up by real treaſons againſt the people. I do not believe, I never did believe, the general charges made againſt the Catholics—I do not diſpute, I never did diſpute, the propriety of giving ſalaries to their Clergy; but it ſhould be ſalaries not bribes—ſalaries, for the exerciſe of their religious duty, and not wages for the practice of political apoſtacy. According to this plan, the Catholic religion it would ſeem, diſqualified its followers to receive the bleſſings of the Conſtitution; but his hoſtilities to that Conſtitution qualifies him to receive a ſalary, for the exerciſe of that very religion which is at once puniſhed by civil diſability and encouraged by eccleſiaſtical proviſion; as good Catholics they are diſqualified, and as bad citizens they are to be rewarded. I dare ſay, in general, the Catholic clergy will feel on this occaſion, as they have done upon others, a regard for their native land, ſuperior to the threats of a Miniſter.

The Miniſter proceeds—he propoſes his third bribe, the abolition of tythes. You obſerve, ſuch a propoſal does not ſeem to form part of his Union, but is an office kept back to be regulated, modified, and qualified when the Union is paſt, and the conſideration is given. I approve of a modus as a compenſation for tythes; but I do not approve of it as a compenſation for Parliament; when I propoſed that meaſure, and was oppoſed by men by whom I could only be oppoſed, and could not be anſwered. I was told by the King's Miniſters that commutation of tythes was the overturn of the Church; couple then the project of the Miniſter now, with the argument of his agents then, and the combined idea amounts to this, that it is prudent to overturn the Church, provided at the ſame time you overturn the Conſtitution: but the fact is, that the argument at that time was falſe, and the propoſal at this time was fallacious, and both ſhew that the argument had for its object perſonal calumny, and the propoſal national extinction.

The Miniſter has not done with bribes—whatever economy he ſhews in argument, here he has been generous in the extreme. Parſon, Prieſt, (I think one of his advocates hints the Preſbyterians) not forgotten, and now the mercantile body are to be all bribed, that all may be ruined. He holds our commercial benefits for political annihilation; he offers you an abundance of capital, but firſt he takes it away; he takes away a great portion of the landed capital of the country by the neceſſary operation of Union. He will give you, however, commercial

mercial capital in its place, but first he will give you taxes, it seems 'tis only necessary to break down the barriers of Liberty, and the tides of commerce will flow in of course; take away her rival in landed capital, and then commercial capital advances without fear; commerce only wants weight, it seems, in order to run with new spirit; he not only finds commerce in the retreat of landed capital, but he finds corn also—why not wine? If the removal of landed capital shall produce wheat, why not the distance of the sun wine; why any method in his madness, when there is so much madness in his method; his whole speech is a course of surprises; the growth of excision, the resource of incumbrance, and harvests sown and gathered by the absence of the proprietor of the soil and their property: all these things are to come, when; he does not tell you—where he does not tell you; you take his word for all this. I have heard of a banker's bill of exchange, bank of England's notes, bank of Ireland's notes, but a prophet's promissory note is a new traffic; all he gets from Ireland is solid loss; all he promises, visionary, distant, and prophetic advantages; he sees, I do not, British merchants and British capital, sailing to the provinces of Connaught and Munster, where the Orangeman had sent the Defender; there they settle great multitudes, themselves and families. He mentions not what description of manufacturers—who from Birmingham—who from Manchester—no matter—he cares not—he goes on asserting with great ease to himself and without any obligation to fact, upon the subject; Icada imagination is the region in which he delights to disport; where he is to take away your Parliament; where he is to take away your first judicature; where he is to take away your money; where he is to encrease your taxes; where he is to get an Irish tribute—there he is a plain direct matter of fact man; but where he is to pay you for all this; there he is poetic and prophetic—no longer a third-hand financier, but an inspired accomptant: Fancy gives him her wand; Amalthea takes him by the hand; Ceres is in his train. The English capitalists, he thinks, will settle his family in the midst of those Irish Catholics whom he does not think it safe to admit into Parliament; as subjects, he thinks them dangerous; as a neighbouring multitude, safe; the English manufacturer will make this distinction—he will dread them as individuals, and confide in them as a body, and settle his family and his property in the midst of them; he will, therefore, the Minister supposes, leave his mines, leave his machinery, leave his comforts, leave his habits, conquer his prejudices, and come over to Ireland to meet his taxes and miss his Constitution; they did not do this when the taxes of Ireland were few? we were indeed told they would, as we are now told; they did not do this when there was no Military Government in Ireland; however, as prejudices against the country encrease, he supposes

commercial

commercial confidence may encreaſe likewiſe—There is no contradicting all this; becauſe arguments which reaſon does not ſuggeſt, reaſon cannot remove; beſides, the Miniſter in all this does not argue, but foretell; now you can ſcarcely anſwer a Prophet, you can only diſbelieve him; his arguments are falſe, but his inſpirations may be true: appearances, however, are againſt them; for inſtance, a principal ground of complaint in Ireland is a miſapplication of landed capital, or the diverſion of it to foreign countries from the cultivation of Ireland, where great tracts remain either totally neglected, or ſuperficially improved; where the tenantry has not capital, and the land can be reclaimed only by the employment (and a very rational employment it would be) of part of the rent ariſing therefrom, on the ſoil which produced it, improving however gradually ſince the eſtabliſhment of our free Conſtitution, which contains in itſelf the powers of checking the evil I ſpeak of, and which, by adding to the conſequence of the country, will naturally diminiſh the number of Abſentees, aided as it muſt be by the growth of Engliſh taxes, unleſs by a Union we adopt thoſe taxes in Ireland. How does he remedy this diſorder? He finds a great Abſentee draught; he gives you another, and having ſecured to you two complaints, he engages to cure both. Another principal cauſe of complaint is another effect ariſing from the non-reſidence of Iriſh Landlords, whoſe preſence on their own eſtates is neceſſary for the ſuccour, as well as the improvement of their tenantry---that the peaſants may not periſh for want of medicine, of cordial, and of cure, which they can only find in the adminiſtration of the Landlord, who civilizes them, and regulates them in the capacity of a Magiſtrate, while he huſbands and covers them in that of a protector, improving not only them but himſelf by the exerciſe of his virtues, as well as the diſpenſation of his property, drawing together the two orders of ſociety---the rich and poor---until each may adminiſter to the other, and civilize---the one by giving, and the other by receiving---ſo that Ariſtocracy and Democracy may have a head and a body; ſo that the rich may bring on the poor, and the poor may ſupport the rich, and both contributing to the ſtrength, order, and beauty of the State, may form that pillar of ſociety, where all below is ſtrength, and all above is grace. How does his plan accompliſh this? he withdraws their landed gentlemen, and then improves Iriſh manners by Engliſh factors.—But I leave his trifling, and come to his threats.

As he offered before a trade which he had not to give, ſo now he menaces to withdraw a trade which he cannot take away—His threat is founded on a monſtrous aſſertion that our principal branches of commerce are due to the liberality of England. Liberality of England to Iriſh Commerce!—Where are we to look for it? In what part of this century, for near an hundred

years, it is a long time, the Miniſter himſelf, diſclaims the illiberal policy of his country---Is it at the cloſe of the century for inſtance, in his Majeſty's ſpeech from the Throne, in the year 75, where he is adviſed to ſignify his intention to maintain the principle of American taxation over all his dominions, or is it in the embargo of the ſame period, or is it in the Tea Tax impoſed on Ireland by the Britiſh Parliament about the period of 79---or will he ſay this liberality appears in the mockery of thoſe bills in which England affected to relieve the diſtreſſes of Ireland ---was it in the Engliſh act, giving the Iriſh a power to catch whale, or in that other bill permitting the Iriſh to plant tobacco ---or was it in 98, that this liberality made its appearance? No; for I remember in that period moving an addreſs for the extenſion of Iriſh commerce---and I remember alſo being oppoſed and defeated by the immediate interpoſition of the Crown. It is not then in the period of 78 that we are to look for this liberality---was it in the period of 79---the time of the ſhort money bill of the non-conſumption agreement---of the Iriſh requiſition of free trade.

Here is the liberality of England---ſhe was juſt then---ſhe was liberal never; and ſhe was juſt to you then, becauſe you were then juſt to yourſelf;---ſhe has been faithful ſince---I ſhall be ſatisfied for one, with her fidelity and juſtice, and on theſe occaſions I acknowledge both. Are there any further inſtances in which we are to look for Engliſh juſtice in the ſubject of Iriſh Trade —Yes, there is another in 93, on the ſubject of the re-export ---an attempt had been made to carry that point for Ireland in 1786, contained in two reſolutions, which I moved as an amendment to the Navigation act, which has been charged to Ireland as a favour, but which was in fact jobbed to the Britiſh Miniſtry by him who made the charge, and ſold without any clauſe of equality and reciprocality---but afterwards in 93, a re-export bill paſſed in Great Britain in favour of Ireland, exactly at the time when the charter of the Eaſt India company expired, and an Iriſh bill was neceſſary and did paſs to ſecure her monopoly for a limited time; ſuch is the hiſtory of Britiſh conceſſion. Now look at the tariff, or ſee what has been the reſult, greatly in favour of England. Under the head of Home Manufacture, and Colonial Produce, in favour of England---under the head of Raw Material the produce of the reſpective countries above two millions in favour of England. Under the head of Foreign Articles a great balance in favour of England, add to this an Abſentee Rental of conſiderably above a million, and you will find there is a balance of a ſum of above four millions annually, in which Ireland adminiſters to Great Britain, and pours herſelf, as it were abundantly and without reſerve into the Britiſh dominion.

This

This is the trade the Miniſter threatens to alter, and thinks he threatens not Great Britain but Ireland---here he will have ſome difficulty, and firſt, the covenant of 79, he denies that covenant, he ſays that all the great commercial advantages of Ireland are to be aſcribed to the liberality of the Britiſh Parliament, and not to the Iriſh Parliament—Wherever he meets an Iriſh covenant he gives it no quarter--- I will ſtate the fact, and let the public judge: in October 79, an addreſs paſſed the Iriſh Commons, containing a requiſition for a Free Trade, it was followed by a motion declaring that the Iriſh Commons would not for the preſent, grant new taxes, it was followed by a limitation of the act of ſupply to the duration of ſix months only---it was conſidered in England, and attended with reſolutions moved by the then Miniſter, purporting to repeal certain reſtrictive acts on the free trade of Ireland, and to grant a direct intercourſe between Ireland, and his Majeſty's plantations ſubject to equality of duty---theſe reſolutions were conſidered in the Parliament of Ireland---[See the reſolutions and the law expreſſing the condition and covenant]---they were voted ſatisfactory. A long money bill was then paſſed, and new taxes were then granted in conſideration thereof, and this he calls no covenant---he has denied, it ſeems, the linen covenant---he has denied this commercial covenant of 1779, and he has denied the conſtitutional covenant of 1782---and having diſclaimed the obligation of three treaties, he now propoſes a fourth, founded on his denial of the three others, in which he deſires you to give up your Parliament to ſecure his faith in time to come by encouraging his diſavowal of former covenants.

I argue in a different manner---I argue from his diſpoſition to diſpute the validity of covenant to the neceſſity of the exiſtence of Parliament---an Iriſh Parliament---the guarantee of thoſe covenants, who has power to preſerve the obligation, or reſources to retaliate. Does the Miniſter, when he talks of an eleemoſynary trade, recollect how the Iriſh Parliament could affect the Eaſt India Company, by diſcontinuing the act of 1793, granted but for a limited time? Does he recollect how ſhe could affect the Britiſh Weſt India monopoly, by withdrawing her excluſive conſumption from the Britiſh plantations? Does he recollect how we could affect the navy of England, by regulaions regarding our Iriſh proviſions: Does he recollect how we could affect her empire, by forming commercial intercourſe with the reſt of the world---but let not this depend upon idle threats, threats which never ſhould have been advanced on one ſide, if they had not been firſt moſt imprudently introduced on his. I ſay, let not the argument reſt on threats---but let it reſt quiet on the paſt experiment—the experiment has been made—we got our trade by our reſources and our Parliament---we will keep our trade by affection and by covenant---but ſhould a Britiſh

Miniſter chooſe to deſpiſe thoſe tenures, we have another, we can keep our trade by the means by which we have obtained it, our Parliament, our reſources.

He ſpeaks of the linen trade. On this ſubject, indeed, he has been anſwered, as he has upon the others, by the argument and by the experiment; the argument which proves that the bounty on linen was not granted for the ſake of Ireland, and that Iriſh linen ſells itſelf. But ſuppoſe his reaſoning in this caſe to be as true as it is fallacious, what does it amount to? That his country robbed Ireland of her free trade in the laſt century, and gave her in the place of it, the export of one ſolitary manufacture, depending on the charity of England, and now propoſes to rob Ireland of that manufacture, unleſs Ireland conſents to be robbed of her Parliament. Has he no other ground of triumph but the diſgrace and diſhonor of his country; however, her caſe is better than he has ſtated it, and that is proved by the experiment; for in 1779, we were encountered by the ſame threats on the ſame ſubject---we deſpiſed thoſe threats, we put the queſtion to a trial---we entered into a non-conſumption agreement---we demanded a free trade---the free trade we obtained---the linen trade we preſerved.

What he cannot reconcile to the intereſt he affects to reconcile to the honor—He, the Miniſter (his budget crammed with corruption) propoſes to you to give up the ancient inheritance of your country, to proclaim an utter and blank incapacity to make laws for your own people, and to regiſter this proclamation in an act which inflicts on this ancient nation an eternal diſability—and he accompanies theſe monſtrous propoſals by undiſguiſed terror, and unqualified bribery, and this he calls no attack on the honor and dignity of the kingdom.

The thing he propoſes to buy, is what cannot be ſold---Liberty. For it he has nothing to give---every thing of value which you poſſeſs you obtained under a free Conſtitution---part with it, and you muſt be not only a ſlave but an idiot.

His propoſitions, not only go to your diſhonor, but they are built upon nothing elſe—he tells you, it is his main argument, that you are unfit to exerciſe a free Conſtitution, and he affects to prove it by the experiment. Jacobiniſm grows, ſays he, out of the very ſtate and condition of Ireland. I have heard of Parliament impeaching Miniſters, but here is a Miniſter impeaching Parliament---he does more; he impeaches the Parliamentary Conſtitution itſelf; the abuſes in that Conſtitution he has protected, it is only its being that he deſtroys—on what ground?—Your exports ſince your emancipation, and under that Parliamentary Conſtitution, and in a great meaſure by that Parliamentary Conſtitution have nearly doubled---commercially it has worked well. Your concord with England ſince the emancipation, as far as it relates to Parliament on the ſubject

of

of war, has been not only approved, but has been productive—imperially therefore, it has worked well. What then does the Miniſter in fact object to? That you have ſupported him, that you have concurred in his ſyſtem, therefore he propoſes to the people to aboliſh the Parliament and to continue the Miniſter---he does more---he propoſes to you to ſubſtitute the Britiſh Parliament in your place, to deſtroy the body that reſtored your liberties, and reſtore that body which deſtroyed them---againſt ſuch a propoſition were I expiring on the floor I ſhould beg to utter my laſt breath, and to record my dying teſtimony.

ROYAL EXCHANGE, DUBLIN.

January 13th, 1800.

At a numerous and reſpectable meeting of the ROMAN CATHOLICS of the city of Dublin, convened purſuant to public notice,

AMBROSE MOORE, Eſq. in the CHAIR.

Reſolved, That we are of opinion that the propoſed incorporate Union of the Legiſlatures of Great Britain and Ireland, is in fact an extinction of the liberty of this country, which would be reduced to the abject condition of a province, ſurrendered to the mercy of the Miniſter and Legiſlature of another country, to be bound by their abſolute will, and taxed at their pleaſure, by laws in the making of which this country could have no efficient participation whatſoever.

Reſolved, That we are of opinion that the improvement of Ireland for the laſt twenty years, ſo rapid beyond example, is to be aſcribed wholly to the independency of our Legiſlature, ſo glorioufly aſſerted in the year 1782, by the virtue of our Parliament co-operating with the generous recommendation of our moſt gracious and benevolent Sovereign, and backed by the ſpirit of our People; and ſo ſolemnly ratified by both kingdoms, as the only true and permanent foundation of Iriſh proſperity and Britiſh Connexion.

Reſolved, That we are of opinion, that if the Independency ſhould ever be ſurrendered, we muſt as rapidly relapſe into our former depreſſion and miſery; and that Ireland muſt inevitably loſe, with her liberty, all that ſhe has acquired in wealth, and induſtry, and civilization.

Reſolved, That we are firmly convinced that the ſuppoſed advantages of ſuch a ſurrender, are unreal and deluſive, and never can riſe in fact: and that even if they ſhould ariſe, they would be only the bounty of the Maſter to the Slave, held by his courteſy, and reſumable at his pleaſure.

Reſolved,

Reſolved, That having heretofore determined not to come forward any more in the diſtinct character of Catholic, but to conſider our claims and our cauſe not thoſe of a Sect, but as involved in the general fate of our Country, that we now think it right, notwithſtanding ſuch determination, to publiſh the preſent Reſolutions, in order to undeceive our fellow-ſubjects, who may have been led to believe by a falſe Repreſentation, that we are capable of giving any concurrence whatſoever to ſo foul and fatal a project; to aſſure them that we are incapable of ſacrificing our common Country to either pique or pretenſion; and that we are of opinion, that this deadly attack upon the Nation is the great call of nature, of Country, and Poſterity, upon Iriſhmen of all deſcriptions and perſuaſions, to every conſtitutional and legal reſiſtance; and that we ſacredly pledge ourſelves, to perſevere in obedience to that call as long as we have life.

Signed by Order,
JAMES RYAN, Sec.

GUILD OF MERCHANTS, DUBLIN.

At a full Hall of the Maſters, Wardens and Brethren of the Corporation of Merchants or Guild of the Holy Trinity, Dublin, held at the Exhibition Houſe in William-ſtreet, on Wedneſday, the 15th Day of January, 1800, being an Adjournment of the Chriſtmas Quarter Day.

The following Reſolutions were unanimouſly agreed to;

Reſolved, That it is the Opinion of this Corporation, that it is now neceſſary to make an explicit and unequivocal declaration of our ſentiments againſt the meaſure of an incorporate Union of Ireland with Great Britain, and to publiſh them to the kingdom.

Reſolved, That we behold with ſorrow and indignation, the revival of a Queſtion already condemned by the Parliament and People of Ireland.

Reſolved, That we deny in the moſt ſolemn and decided manner, the competence of Parliament to change our Conſtitution. We repoſed a truſt in our Repreſentatives, which they can ſurrender to none but us; we repoſed it for a limited time, and have ever ſince conſidered its duties bounded by the Conſtitution—our Repreſentatives may act within the pale of that Conſtitution—NO POWER on earth has a right to deſtroy it.

Reſolved, That the meaſure of a Legiſlative Union is fraught with every bad conſequence to the Liberties, Peace, and Proſperity of our country; nor are its miſchiefs more dreadful in any point of View, than that by which it tends to endanger the happy Connexion, at preſent ſubſiſting between the countries.

Reſolved,

Reſolved, that we look with horror and diſguſt at the arts practiſed, with unbluſhing effrontery, to defraud us of a Conſtitution which was acquired by ſo much virtue, and maintained with ſo much glory---we cannot think that a Meaſure ſupported by the annihilation of all honourable feeling, and propped up by the moſt audacious traffick, can be either uſeful or permanent ---'tis to us equal whether it be the reſult of fraud or force, in either Caſe it is Tyranny, and Tyranny never had in any country or in any age, a righteous claim to Submiſſion.

Reſolved, That we have ſeen with joy and ſatisfaction the manly declaration of our Catholic Fellow Citizens, and we agree with them in thinking that nothing can preſerve and ſupport our Conſtitution but the cordial co-operation of all ſects in its defence.

Reſolved, That our ſincere and grateful thanks are juſtly due, and are hereby given to John Claudius Beresford, Eſq. and the Right Honourable George Ogle, our Repreſentatives in Parliament, for their manly and decided Oppoſition to a Meaſure ſo odious to their Conſtituents.

Reſolved, That our ſincere Thanks be returned to our worthy ſenior Maſter, Robert Powell, Eſq. for his ready compliance with the wiſhes of the Brethren, in calling this Hall, and for his very proper conduct in the Chair.

Reſolved, That the above Reſolutions be ſigned by our Clerk, and Publiſhed.

Signed by Order of the Corporation,
TIM. ALLEN, Clk. of the Guild.

AGGREGATE MEETING.

16 *January*, 1800.

At a moſt numerous and reſpectable Meeting of the FREEMEN and FREEHOLDERS of the City of Dublin, aſſembled this day by Requiſition at the ſeſſions-houſe.

The HIGH SHERIFFS in the Chair,

The following Gentlemen were conſtituted a Committee, who reported the following Reſolution and Addreſs, which were unanimouſly agreed to by the Meeting; Mr. Hartley, Mr. Deaſe, Mr. Rawlins, Mr. R. M'Donnell, Mr. Moore, and Mr. Alderman Howiſon.

1. That the Conſtitution of Ireland, as eſtabliſhed at the memorable period of 1782, is the indefeaſable and unalienable Right of ourſelves, and our Poſterity.

2. That we do moſt ſolemnly and firmly proteſt againſt any acts which in deſtroying that Conſtitution, exceeds the Powers, with

with which our Repreſentatives in Parliament have been inveſted; and we do aſſert, that they have no Right to adopt the diſgraceful propoſal of this our extinction for ever. *Their* powers are limited in time and extent, but the rights of the People are unpreſcriptable and immortal.

3. That the re-propoſal of the meaſure of a Legiſlative Union with Great Britain to the ſame Parliament, which not a year ſince rejected even its diſcuſſion with indignation, is as inſulting, as its conſequences may be dreadful.

4. That the means reſorted to, for the purpoſe of procuring a Parliamentary concurrence in this meaſure, and a deluſive approbation of the People, are baſe and unconſtitutional; and we call on thoſe who ſupported the meaſure, to recollect that while they think they can violate the Conſtitution with impunity, we remember we have taken a ſolemn oath to maintain it.

5. That we contemplate with horror, the ungenerous language held to us in the hour of our diſtreſs---The manner in which we acquired our glorious Conſtitution is openly avowed; it remains only for us to ſay, that a Conſtitution which we proudly aſſerted, ought never to be baſely ſurrendered, and we pledge ourſelves moſt ſolemnly, while we have life, we never will be the willing ſlaves of diſhonorable negotiation.

6. That we hail the auſpicious moment of internal Unanimity, when the cordial concurrence and co-operation of all ſects and perſuaſions, as common brothers in a common cauſe, ſhall render any attempt upon our liberties, from whatever quarter it may proceed, diſgraceful and ineffectual.

7. That the grateful thanks of this meeting be returned to the virtuous minority of the Houſe of Commons, who ſupported the independence of Ireland, by oppoſing a Legiſlative Union with Great Britain.

8. That our worthy Repreſentatives, J. C. BERESFORD, Eſq. and the Right Honorable GEORGE OGLE, highly merit, and we do hereby tender them our ſincere acknowledgements for their uniform and ſteady oppoſition to an attempt to annihilate the independence of Ireland.

9. That our warmeſt thanks and gratitude are due, and are hereby given, to the Right Honorable JOHN FOSTER, Speakee of the Houſe of Commons, whoſe virtuous and patriotic conduct, have endeared him to every Iriſhman, who loves his country; and that we can never deſpair of the ſucceſs of a cauſe, ſupported by the talents and virtue of a man, who has on all occaſions, proved himſelf the ſteady friend of Ireland.

10. That we feel the moſt lively ſatisfaction at the return of our late able and virtuous Repreſentative, H. GRATTAN, Eſq. to our Senate, at this alarming criſis of our liberty; and that we derive the moſt encouraging preſage from the addition of ſuch ſplendid talents, and ſuch well-tried virtue, to the honeſt friends

of

of Ireland, who unſeduced by corruption, and unawed by power, have continued firm to the truſt repoſed in them by their country—and that the following Addreſs be preſented to Mr. Grattan:

SIR,

"For your Spirit and Patriotiſm, accept our moſt grateful acknowledgments. You have come forward at a time moſt critical to Iriſh Liberty, to ſave the Conſtitution.

"This attempt of the Miniſter, the annexation for ever of the kingdom of Ireland to the Britiſh Parliament, is hateful to every lover of his country. When you ſo illuſtriouſly diſtinguiſhed yourſelf in eſtabliſhing the independence of the Iriſh Legiſlature, the ſupport of the People was not wanting. You will have it on this occaſion; and with your virtues and talents, it would be criminal to deſpair of ſucceſs."

Reſolved, That the High Sheriffs be requeſted to preſent ſaid Reſolutions and Addreſs, accompanied by ſuch Freemen and Freeholders as chuſe to attend.

Reſolved, That the aforeſaid Reſolutions, with the Anſwer of the Speaker, our Repreſentatives, and Mr. Grattan, (when received) be printed.

The High Sheriff having quit the Chair, it was taken by Mr. Alderman CROTHERS, and the unanimous thanks of the Meeting were returned to the High Sheriffs, for their patriotic conduct diſplayed by their readineſs in calling this Meeting, and their highly proper conduct in the Chair.

The High Sheriffs were pleaſed to appoint Saturday, at one o'clock, to meet at the Royal Exchange, to proceed to the ſeveral Gentlemen with the Reſolutions of Thanks and Addreſs.

The following is a Sketch of what fell from Mr. CURRAN at the Aggregate Meeting of Freemen and Freeholders of the City of Dublin:

He began by ſpeaking in the higheſt terms of the noble ſtand Mr. Foſter had made for Ireland; it was manly, ardent, and truly diſintereſted. When it was notorious what others had received for betraying, it was eaſy to ſee what he muſt have refuſed. He was happy to find this ſentiment of gratitude and reſpect ſo warm and ſo genial; it had his moſt cordial concurrence. It was time for us all to learn from the leſſons of calamity; to unlearn the fatal follies that had brought Ireland again to the bed of ſickneſs—perhaps to the bed of death. One only road to ſafety remained, the unanimity of the people. The capital had nobly ſet the example. If the country followed the example, Ireland could not be loſt. The projected ſurrender of Ireland would be defeated. This new ſecret expedition would add juſt as many laurels to the unprincipled

unprincipled projector as the laſt had done. Here Mr. Curran adverted to the projected Union. It was, he ſaid, a baſe violation of the ſolemn compact of 1782; a baſe ſurrender of the birthright of Ireland, which we were intitled to, independent of any compact, which we had no power to give up; which the Parliament, a mere truſtee for the people, can't give up without the baſeſt perfidy, which the King is bound by his coronation oath to maintain. The ſurrender of which is ſought for the vileſt purpoſes, by the vileſt means; by bribe, by terror, an army in the country, an armed incubus ſitting upon the public heart. Upon theſe topics he dwelt in a pointed manner. But what, ſaid he, are the motives of the Miniſter, that can urge him to ſo deſperate a folly as reduces the obedience to the laws from a principle conſcience to a queſtion of prudence? He knows it muſt hazard the connexion; more neceſſary now than ever it was---he knows it ſubverts the conſtitution of Ireland, of England alſo; neither country will have laws made ſolely by their own people. He knows that one hundred needy provincial members in his pocket, and he in theirs, muſt turn the government of both countries into an abſolute deſpotiſm. Why then attempt ſuch an atrocity? I anſwer, ſaid he, for the ſake of that very deſpotiſm. I anſwer, ſaid he, in order to bind you by ſuch laws as no Parliament would venture to propoſe in their own country--it is to have your property at his mercy---to tax you at his will---to levy his taxes with the bayonet. Why does England ſtand ſilent and torpid at this hour of common peril? She thinks her Miniſter deſpotic as he may be, (and he has brought her to bend under his deſpotiſm) will ſeek popularity by taxing Ireland. A Parliament of Engliſhmen has an intereſt in taxing you---at leaſt they will be taught to think ſo---at leaſt paid for doing ſo. Such is ever the mixture of folly and cruelty which the province feel, and the principal nation never feels for their calamity. Did Spain feel for the Low Countries? Did Rome for Sicily? Did England for America? No, ſhe ſent her tax-gatherers---the Americans refuſed, and her next meſſengers were murder and conflagration. And England applauded until ſhe forced that unhappy country upon Revolution. Yes, I repeat unhappy! Unhappy is that country which is obliged to wade back to Liberty through blood, and to mix the ſong of triumph with the lamentation of the grave. Unhappy therefore only ſhould I call this country in a ſimilar event, for we could not continue long in ſlavery; we ſhould have a terrible interval to paſs, marked by the ſuſpenſion of induſtry and commerce, as well as of liberty; by the flight of the proprietor, and of the capitaliſt; by the beggary of unlimited taxation, and the government of a foreign ſoldiery: the robbery of a poor people like us, would not relieve the oppreſſed and ſhattered finances of England, but it would force us back upon our freedom, the very proſpect of it had now forced us in to concord. It was only our diviſions that expoſed us to danger

ger; in the crucible of common misery, we were molten into a common mass; we felt at last that we have been drinking the bitter dregs of our own malice, and that we were punished as we deserved.

He could not express, he said, what his heart felt when he beheld this cordial reconciliation of his countrymen. Our enemies must ever rise and fall together with our dissensions; our dissensions he trusted were gone for ever. If so, he said, and he could not bring himself to doubt it, we had a merit that no other nation has been able to claim. It seems to be the peculiar nature of religious animosities that their folly appeared only to the succeeding age: which age, while it laughed at the past, was itself carried away by some new folly equally furious and frivolous, and providing ample fund of melancholy merriment for the age to come. Here Mr. Curran adverted to the nature of our religious distractions, to the gross barbarism and folly of them, and to their fatal fruits--poverty and wretchedness at home; laughter and contempt abroad. This reconciliation, he said, should not be confined to the capital. The nation ought to hear her own voice, her enemies ought to hear it, and above all, her Parliament ought to hear it: he said, that in the present struggle the Irish Parliament had given a noble proof of the value of popular representation; cut it into a thousand pieces, in every segment of it, you find political vitality. It has shown that upon great questions it feels its fate and its fortunes to be in common with the people; the rapid advancement of Ireland for the last twenty years, was an irrefragable proof of this: here he alluded to the various efforts of the Irish Parliament for the last twenty years for Irish trade and Irish independence. So it must ever be, he observed, where a nation has a resident Parliament however imperfect it may be. When the Parliament floats in the great mass of the People, it cannot be so caulked by corruption, as that some seams will not remain open through which it will imbibe the nation; we have, said he, all the virtue and all the talent of Parliament at our side, let us add to that the virtue of all the People, and our success is infallible. If we do not give them that aid our ruin is equally inevitable. Without our own ardent co-operation, what can we hope from our friends in Parliament; with all their virtues and their talents, what barrier can they form without our own assistance; at the best, an uncemented wall, destitute of that connexion, which nothing but support can give, it must be soon overwhelmed in the overbearing tide of corruption: and the place where it stood will be covered with sand, upon that sand the child in his sport may write "Liberty," and that word will be a record, until the first breath of Heaven shall scatter it, or the first surge of the deep wash it away--but give to that wall a firm and consolidated embankment behind it, and it will say to the proud wave of Britain, "thus far hast thou come,

but

but no farther ſhalt thou advance." Mr. Curran here adverted to the reſolutions propoſed, he ſaid, they were wiſe, loyal, moderate and firm. Without temper and moderation there cannot be firmneſs. They were calculated to awaken, but not to exaſperate; to animate, not to inflame, to reconcile, not to divide; to unite the nation in a combined and generous effort to preſerve its own life; to avert the danger of the empire, which could not ſurvive the connexion with Ireland; to avert the horrors of provincial ſlavery, of imported laws, and an imported army to enforce them; of a baniſhed or degraded gentry, and of a populace famiſhed and infuriated, withering upon the ſurface of the ſoil, which ought to give them nouriſhment, and to which they ought to give protection. He concluded a number of very intereſting obſervations, which he preſſed with much anxiety upon the audience, and of which we are ſorry to give ſo imperfect a detail, by again enforcing the neceſſity of a cordial oblivion of all reſentments. I know, ſaid he, our ſituation; I know the tempeſt is ſtrong, and the waves are high, and that every plank is ſtrained. I know the villains have laboured to commit you with one another, to implicate you in your own ſenſeleſs and fatal malice, to make you enamoured of a common perdition, to make you at once their dupes and their victims. I know at this moment they are preparing to bore thoſe holes in the veſſel, and calculating the interval of your ſinking and of their eſcape. I tell you again, that without your own co-operation you muſt infallibly ſink, and that you deſerve to ſink for ever.

GENTLEMEN,

I AM truly thankful for your approbation of my conduct, and the very flattering terms in which it is expreſſed.

My ſincere conviction of the ruinous conſequences attendant on a Legiſlative Union, bound me to oppoſe it. Every day's reflection ſince has ſerved to encreaſe that conviction, and to ſhew me that the great ſafeguard and the true ſecurity of our own liberties, and of what is equally dear to every loyal Iriſhman, our perpetual connexion with Great Britain, lie in the preſervation of a ſeparate independent Parliament within the kingdom, under the Conſtitution eſtabliſhed and ratified in 1782.

Accept my warmeſt thanks, and believe me to be, with the moſt ſincere reſpect and attachment, your very faithful and obedient ſervant, JOHN FOSTER.

GENTLEMEN,

YOUR Reſolutions does us great honour—we are grateful for it. When we ceaſe to deſerve your confidence we hope you will withdraw it from us for ever.

J. C. BERESFORD.
GEORGE OGLE.

GENTLEMEN,

GENTLEMEN,

I AGREE with you in thinking the preſent criſis to be truly alarming. After conſidering the project of a Union fully, fairly, and diſpaſſionately, with every advantage promiſed and profeſſed, I do really and ſincerely think it the worſt meaſure ever propoſed in the country. I ſhall contribute my mite to oppoſe it.—I have no confidence in the powers of my own broken and ſhattered exertions; but I have ſufficient ſtrength remaining to bear my laſt teſtimony againſt an UNION.

HENRY GRATTAN.

Dublin, Jan. 18, 1800.

AT a General Aſſembly of the Right Honourable the LORD MAYOR, SHERIFFS, COMMONS, and CITIZENS, of the City of Dublin, held at the Exhibition-Houſe in William-ſtreet, on Friday the 17th day of January, 1800. The following Reſolutions were agreed to:—

Reſolved, That a RESIDENT LEGISLATURE in this Kingdom, is an eſſential and vital part of our Conſtitution, and has always been productive of the moſt ſalutary advantages to our country.

Reſolved, That being pledged in the moſt ſolemn manner, to ſupport that Conſtitution, we lament, but feel ourſelves called upon to expreſs our abhorrence of the indirect modes which have been adopted to carry into effect the meaſure of a Legiſlative Union with Great Britain, a meaſure ſo deſtructive to the independence of a Free Nation, ſo ruinous to its happineſs, and ſo fraught with fatal conſequences to our future connexion with the Britiſh Empire.

And, we lament, that any recent circumſtances ſhould oblige us thus again to expreſs our diſapprobation and deteſtation of a Meaſure, which has juſtly excited a ſerious alarm through the whole kingdom.

Ordered, That the foregoing Reſolutions be publiſhed.

Signed by Order,

ALLEN & GREEN, Town Clks.

At a Meeting of the FREEHOLDERS of the County of Dublin, convened by the High Sheriff, at the County Commiſſion Court-Houſe, on Monday the 27th January, 1800;

JOHN GARNETT, Eſq. High Sheriff, in the Chair;

The following Reſolutions were unanimouſly agreed to:

Reſolved, that we with grief and indignation behold the Miniſter again agitating this Country with the queſtion of a

LEGISLATIVE

LEGISLATIVE UNION---a Meaſure, already condemned with merited reprobation by the Houſe of Commons and People of Ireland.

Reſolved, that the deſpotic and corrupt means which have been uſed to force it on the country, are ſuch as muſt excite the reſentment of every honeſt mind, and we have no doubt will call forth the determined oppoſition of every virtuous man in Ireland.

Reſolved, That by a ſeparate independent Parliament, we do not underſtand a ſeparate Intereſt from Great Britain; on the contrary, we are convinced that ſuch a Legiſlature is abſolutely neceſſary to maintain and preſerve inviolate our Connexion with that nation.

Reſolved, that we congratulate our countrymen on that unanimity which with joy and ſatisfaction we now ſee animating the hearts of Iriſhmen of every Sect and Perſuaſion; and we agree with them, that nothing can preſerve our Liberties and our Conſtitution but the cordial co-operation of all in their defence.

Reſolved, That we will make our humble Petition to the Repreſentatives of the People in Parliament, and conjure them to ſhield our Country againſt the imminent danger with which we are threatened, and that our truly virtuous and upright Repreſentatives be requeſted to preſent the ſame.

JOHN GARNETT, High Sheriff.

The thanks of this county were unanimouſly voted to J. GARNETT, Eſq. High Sheriff, for his readineſs in calling this Meeting, and his proper conduct in the Chair.

TO THE KNIGHTS, CITIZENS AND BURGESSES IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED, THE HUMBLE PETITION OF THE FREEHOLDERS OF THE COUNTY OF DUBLIN.

SHEWETH,

THAT we ſincerely and deeply lament that his Majeſty's Miniſters perſevere in the project of a Legiſlative Union; a Meaſure which has been already rejected by the determined and uninfluenced voice of this honourable Houſe and the People of Ireland.

Your Petitioners, with pride and gratitude, beg leave to bring to the recollection of this honourable Houſe, that part of it's memorable Addreſs unanimouſly voted to his Majeſty on the 16th of April 1782, in which are the following words; "That "the Kingdom of Ireland is a diſtinct Kingdom, with a Parliament of her own, the SOLE LEGISLATURE thereof. "That there is NO BODY OF MEN COMPETENT to make "Laws to bind this Nation, except the King, Lords and Com- "mons of Ireland, nor any other Parliament which hath any

"Authority

"Authority or Power of any Sort whatſoever in this Country, "ſave only the Parliament of Ireland. To aſſure his Majeſty, "that we humbly conceive that in this Right the VERY ESSENCE "of our Liberties *exiſts*; a right which, *on the Part of all the "People of Ireland, do claim as their Birth-right, and which we can-"not yield but with our lives.*" A Claim of RIGHT which was acknowledged by a ſolemn Act of the Parliament of Great Britain unſolicited, as is well known to this honourable Houſe on the part of the People of Ireland, namely, by the 23d of his preſent Majeſty, chap. 28. which declares, That "the RIGHT claimed "by the People of Ireland to be bound *only* by laws enacted "by his Majeſty and the Parliament of that Kingdom, in all "Caſes whatever, and to have all actions and ſuits inſtituted "in that kingdom decided in his Majeſty's Courts therein "finally, and without appeal from thence, *ſhall be, and it "hereby declared to be eſtabliſhed and aſcertained* FOR EVER, *and "ſhall at no time hereafter be* QUESTIONED *or* QUESTIONABLE."

That the wiſdom and virtue of this honourable Houſe inſpired their Countrymen to venerate this *right* of the People of Ireland as *ſacred* and INALIENABLE, your Petitioners do therefore ſolemnly conjure this honorable Houſe to reject in the moſt unequivocal terms the meaſure of a Legiſlative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, a *project*, the adoption of which would impair the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland, ſo eſſentially neceſſary to the welfare of both, and muſt immediately *extinguiſh* the Conſtitution of one Country, and in our apprehenſion may eventually ſubvert that of the other. In the vindication of the Conſtitution of Ireland, Parliament may be aſſured of a *ſupport* from the Nation equal to that it experienced at the re-aſſertion of the Conſtitution in 1782; *which Conſtitution the Commons of Ireland have declared that* "THEY COULD NOT YIELD BUT WITH THEIR LIVES."

AND YOUR PETITIONERS WILL PRAY.

WEAVERS-HALL, DUBLIN.

At a meeting of the CORPORATION of WEAVERS, purſuant to notice, held the 29th of January 1800,

THOMAS ABBOTT, Eſq. Maſter, in the Chair.

The following Reſolutions were unanimouſly agreed to:

Reſolved, That before the glorious and memorable period of 1782, this country experienced many of the reſtrictions and the wrongs, which a more powerful nation could impoſe on a ſubject province.

Reſolved, That ſince the re-eſtabliſhment of our rights in an independent reſident Parliament, and the operations of a free Conſtitution, thoſe reſtrictions and wrongs have been removed, political and civil liberty have been placed on a wiſe and liberal baſis,

Trade and Agriculture, Manufactures and Commerce have flourished beyond any example furniſhed by the moſt proſperous nations.

Reſolved, That as a reſident Parliament has been the chief ſource, ſo it is the only guranty of Iriſh freedom and proſperity, and if once relinquiſhed, this Country will have no ſecurity for the maintenance of her rights, or the promotion of her welfare, but in the affection of a rival, and on that faith which has already been moſt *groſsly* and *diſhonorably* violated.

Reſolved, That NO ACT can be equitable or obligatory on us, or our poſterity, which militates againſt the exiſtence of that Conſtitution, which as FREEMEN we have MOST SOLEMNLY SWORN to ſupport with our lives, and to which our FIRST ALLEGIANCE is due.

Reſolved, That the joint co-operation of all the people is eſſentially neceſſary to defeat the deſperate ſcheme of a Legiſlative Union: We therefore behold, with the greateſt ſatisfaction, our Countrymen of every religious deſcription, cordially uniting in vindication of our unalienable rights.

Reſolved, That we adopt the following opinion of Mr. Locke, and do moſt earneſtly recommend it to the conſideration of our Repreſentatives, and the people of Ireland:---

'That the Legiſlative cannot transfer the power of making laws to any other hands; for it being but a delegated power from the people---they who have it cannot paſs it over to others: the power of the Legiſlative being derived from the people, by a voluntary poſitive grant and inſtruction, can be no other than what that poſitive grant conveyed, which being only to make Laws, and NOT TO MAKE LEGISLATORS, the Legiſlative can have no power to transfer their authority of making Laws, and PLACE IT IN OTHER HANDS.'

The MASTER having left the chair, and GEORGE BROWN, Eſq. being called thereto,

Reſolved, That the thanks of this Corporation be given to THOMAS ABBOTT, Eſq. for complying with our requiſition, and for his proper conduct in the Chair.

Reſolved, That the foregoing reſolutions be ſigned by our Clerk and publiſhed.

By order,
CHARLES WALSH, Clerk Guild.

4 OC 58

THE END.